

Planning Commission Minutes of March 25, 2003
7:30 PM Council Chambers
City Hall
401 N. Main Ave.

In Attendance:

Kent Elliott
Clinton Sigmon
Brevard Arndt
Judy Ikerd
Tony Jarrett

Members Absent:

Stan Winstead
Gary Corne

Item 3: Approval of Minutes

Chairman Arndt ruled that the minutes were approved as corrected. Corrections being spelling of various names in the persons present and absent.

Item 4: Public Hearing on Text Amendment 2003-02 Amusement Arcade parking requirements.

Chairman Arndt called to order a scheduled public hearing and asked **Mr. Pattishall** to make a presentation on the draft text amendment. **Mr. Pattishall** said at the last Planning Commission Meeting he had made a presentation requesting the Planning Commission direction concerning a possible text amendment that would change the amount of parking requirements for an amusement arcades. He stated that the current ordinance required 10 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area. He said that after review of various cities in the region, that is appeared that the city's parking requirements for amusement arcades were more stringent than those of surrounding municipalities with the exception of Hickory which had the same requirements. He indicated that the Planning Commission directed him to prepare a draft text amendment that would base the number of parking spaces on the occupant load. **Mr. Pattishall** stated that as proposed the text amendment would allow for parking for amusement arcades to be changed to read .4 spaces per occupant load. He indicated that the occupant load would be determined between the Building Inspector and Fire Inspector and that the Planning Department the Fire Inspector work closely together to govern and the control the occupant load to ensure that there were adequate parking spaces and that the building did not become overcrowded with people and the lot overcrowded with cars that could spill out into adjoining streets and neighborhoods.

Mr. Arndt clarified that the parking area would be a factor in determining occupant load. **Mr. Pattishall** stated that it would.

Mr. Jarrett asked what the staff's recommendation was. **Mr. Pattishall** responded the staff's recommending that the proposed amendment.

Nort Hollar, a realtor, stated that he was working with the city business Rack N Roll who were wanting to move into an older building that had limited parking and that the parking

requirements currently would prevent them from moving into that building, and that this was their only option. He said that they were a clean use and that they would actually make improvements to the old building.

Wendy Curtis said that she was a part owner in the Rack N Roll and that their building had 5,000 square feet of floor area and the current ordinance would require them to have 50 parking spaces. **Judy Ikerd** questioned how many parking spaces would the site have. Mr. Ken Curtis, co-owner, of Rack N Roll stated that 26 spaces were currently on the site. With no further discussion, **Chairman Arndt** closed the public hearing. Motion was made by **Ms. Ikerd** second by **Mr. Jarrett** unanimously adopted to recommend the proposed text amendment to the City Council for approval.

Item 5: Old Business. Continued Discussion on ASP #1

Mr. Pattishall stated over the last couple of meetings he had been getting the Planning Commission information concerning sidewalks in terms of standards for the City. He said that the current time the decision concerning sidewalks was left up to the Sub-Division Review Board. There was no discretion or direction given as to how this would be determined, and that the SRB felt that it needed to have better definitions of what would and what would not and should and should not be required in terms of policy direction and guidance for sidewalk placement and planning for the City. **Mr. Pattishall** displayed a map showing existing sidewalk network, schools, community facilities, and park areas as well as sub-divisions and high density development that have occurred in the last 15 years. He said that the pattern currently was for development inside the city close in there was a good sidewalk network, but as you got out in the outside of the quarry of town, some of the older sub-divisions did not have sidewalks and there was no sidewalk connecting back into town along arterial or collector streets. He said that this should be addressed in some way.

Mr. Arndt and **Mr. Elliott** both said that they felt sidewalks not only were beneficial, in terms of moving people and keeping them out of the street, but they also were attractive in developments.

Mr. Jarrett said that the cost to developers should be considered. He discussed culdascacs and said that viability and sensibility should be determinants of sidewalk requirements.

Mr. Arndt said that sidewalks keep kids out of the street. **Mr. Pattishall** explained that the difficult task is to balance the benefits and the cost and also explained the concept of value. In the need for some plan to guide developers in the city in terms of sidewalk improvements for the future. **Mr. Elliott** and **Ms. Ikerd** said that the city needed to get started sometime and that now seemed the appropriate time.

Mr. Arndt shared a story of a rural sidewalk among cornfields. Also discussed concerns with trees and the plan strip.

Ms. Ikerd questioned what direction should be given to the developer.

Mr. Elliott said that higher density zoning needed to include pedestrian amenities such as sidewalks and trails.

Mr. Arndt discussed sidewalks on one side versus both sides. He said it was a perception of really who benefits or pays.

Mr. Jarrett said personally adding the sidewalk requirements to areas where lots were not selling would be difficult to swallow especially in his development, Cross Creek. He said the additional cost in that development would be about \$25,000.00. He suggested that the city may be required developers to pay up when the development is reached by a sidewalk. He also said that there needed to be a plan to address the issues, benefits, and the advantages.

After general discussion there was a consensus and directive given that the staff would develop a proposal for the Planning Commission to consider, discuss, and evaluate at future meeting. **Mr. Arndt** stated that the ordinance or policies should include some provision for maintenance of sidewalks in terms of grass cutting, snow removal, leaf placement, etc.

Item 6: New Business

Mr. Pattishall distributed information concerning air quality specifically an ozone awareness tool kit. He encouraged the Planning Commission to review the tool kit, and provide him comments or feedback as to any additional things that they thought ought to be in there or to call him if they had questions about what was in the tool kit currently. He stated that this would eventually be used in the early action compact to show that the city's and the region's efforts to reduce ozone emissions and improve air quality. He stated if nothing is done the city and the region will be have a non attainment designation and that this will cause additional costs for emissions testing will prevent the region from receiving federal funds for road improvements and will be a huge deterrent in industry and business location in the area there by effecting jobs, tax base, and quality of life. Not to mention that improved air quality will make it a healthier environment for everyone.

Mr. Jarrett said that it was important to educate the community about air quality. **Mr. Elliott** said that the city should address older vehicles with emissions controls. **Mr. Arndt** said that the Planning Commission should encourage high density development close in where there are sidewalks and pedestrian amenities that are close to shopping, schools, churches, and civic areas. There by cutting down on the need for vehicle trips. **Mr. Jarrett** said sidewalks would cut down on vehicle mileage traveling and he thought that it would be a good thing to look at in terms of air quality.

Item 7: Reports

Mr. Pattishall reviewed the February permit report and planner report.

Item 8:

With no further business appearing the meeting was adjourned at 8:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Glenn J. Pattishall/AICP
Secretary